

COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE
PARASITOLOGY & HELMINTHOLOGY
WINCHES FARM,
395, HATFIELD ROAD

VOLUME 2. Part 2
pp. 33-64.

ST. ALBANS 20th April, 1951

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

21 APR 1951

The Official Organ of
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

<i>Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology :</i>	Page
Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the <i>Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature</i>	33
Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases	34

(continued on back wrapper)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1951

Price Ten shillings

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.) (*President*) (1st January 1944)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cahrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Peirre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (6th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Registrar : Mr. A. S. Pankhurst

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 2, Part 2. (pp. 33 - 64)

20th April, 1951

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (Vol. 2, Part 2) of the *Bulletin*, is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)**(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases**

NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Volume 2, Part 2) in relation to the following names:—

- (1) *Scaphander* Montfort, 1810 (Class Gastropoda, Order Tectibranchiata) (Z.N.(S.)378).
- (2) *Monoculus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Z.N.(S.)377).
- (3) *Rantus* Dejean, 1833 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (Z.N.(S.)171).
- (4) *Acantholyda* Costa, 1894 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) and *Acanthocnema* Becker, 1894 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera) (Z.N. (S.) 175).
- (5) *Rhina* Latreille, [1802–1803], and *Magdalis* Germar, 1817 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) (Z.N.(S.)202).
- (6) *Cardinia* Agassiz, [1841] (Class Lamellibranchiata) (Z.N.(S.)208).

2. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the journals "Nature" and "Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature.*

Secretariat of the
International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature,
28, Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

10th April, 1951.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "SCAPHANDER" MONTFORT, 1810 (CLASS GASTROPODA, ORDER TECTIBRANCHIATA)

By HENNING LEMCHE

(Universitets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)378)

The object of the present application is to seek the assistance of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in providing a valid basis for the well-known generic name *Scaphander* Montfort, 1810 (Class Gastropoda, Order Tectibranchiata). The facts relating to this case are set out in the following paragraphs.

Gioëni (G.) in 1783 (*Descr. nuov. fam. . . . di Testacei trovati nel littorale di Catania*: 25) described an "animal", which proved to be the stomach of *Bulla lignaria* Linnaeus, 1758, (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1**: 727). The specimen described was given the name "*Gioëni*"; this, being uninominal, possesses no status in zoological nomenclature. A year later, however, Philipsson (not Retzius, as incorrectly stated by some authors) cited the record of "*Gioëni*" under the binominal name *Tricla gioëni* (1788, *Diss. Hist. nat. sist. nova Test. Gen.*: 8). Further, Bruguière in 1789 (*Ency. méth. Hist. nat.* Vers **1**: XII) referred to the reference to Gioëni's "*Gioëni*", which he cited under the generic name *Gioënia*; the sole species referred to by him—and therefore the type species by monotypy—he later cited under the name *Gioënia sicula* (1792, *ibid.* **2**: 502).

These "stomach-names" were not accepted by zoologists who have universally applied to the species in question the first generic name to be applied to the shell proper. This name is *Scaphander* Montfort, 1810 (*Conch. syst. Class. méth. Coquilles* **2**: 335); the type species of this genus is *Bulla lignaria* Linnaeus, 1758, by monotypy. Further information is to be found in a paper by the present writer (Lemche, 1948, *Danske Vid. Selsk. biol.* (5)**3**: 86–88), in which are enumerated all available records of this species from the North Atlantic; in the same paper is given a list of all known synonyms of this species.

Winckworth (1932, *J. Conch.* **19**: 232; *id.*, 1933, *ibid.* **19**: 334) is the only author who has argued in favour of reverting to the name *Tricla* Philipsson, 1788, in preference to the later but universally accepted name *Scaphander* Montfort, 1810. Winckworth's action in re-instating the name *Tricla* has, so far as can be ascertained, been followed in only three subsequent papers, namely: (1) Fisher, 1935, *J. Conch.* **20**: 120; (2) Moore, 1937, *Proc. Liverpool biol. Soc.* **50**: 186; (3) Brouwer, 1945, *Basteria* **9**: 64.

The large animals with which we are here concerned are extremely well known to zoologists, and the name *Scaphander* is known widely outside the narrow circle of specialists engaged in the study of the tectibranchs. The

abandonment of the name *Scaphander* which has been universally used for these animals for about 150 years (except in the few papers referred to above) would lead to quite unnecessary confusion and would be quite unwarranted. It is for this reason that I now ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the undermentioned names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—
 - (a) the generic name *Tricla* Philipsson, 1788 ;
 - (b) the generic name *Gioënia* Bruguière, 1789 ;
 - (c) the specific trivial name *gioëni* Philipsson, 1788 (as published in the binominal combination *Tricla gioëni*) ;
 - (d) the specific trivial name *sicula* Bruguière, 1792 (as published in the binominal combination *Gioënia sicula*) ;
- (2) to place the generic name *Scaphander* Montfort, 1810 (type species, by monotypy : *Bulla lignaria* Linnaeus, 1758) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (3) to place the trivial name *lignaria* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Bulla lignaria*) in the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;
- (4) to place the generic names specified in (1)(a) and (b) above, as proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (5) to place the trivial names specified in (1)(c) and (d) above, as proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

**PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY
POWERS OF THE GENERIC NAME "MONOCULUS"
LINNAEUS, 1758**

By H. MUNRO FOX, F.R.S.

(Bedford College, London University)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)377)

The Linnean genus *Monoculus* (1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 634) has now vanished from zoological literature. Each of its nine species has been put into a different newer genus. The genera are the following (using the enumeration in the *Systema Naturae*):—

Name of species	Genus in which species now placed
1. <i>Monoculus Polyphemus</i>	<i>Limulus</i> Müller, 1785
2. <i>M. foliaceus</i>	<i>Argulus</i> Müller, 1785
3. <i>M. Apus</i>	<i>Lepidurus</i> Leach, 1819
4. <i>M. Pulex</i>	<i>Daphnia</i> Müller, 1785
5. <i>M. Pediculus</i>	<i>Polyphemus</i> Müller, 1776
6. <i>M. quadricornis</i>	<i>Cyclops</i> Müller, 1776
7. <i>M. conchaceus</i>	<i>Cypris</i> Müller, 1776
8. <i>M. lenticularis</i>	<i>Limnadia</i> Brongniard, 1820
9. <i>M. Telemus</i>	<i>Cavolina</i> Abildgaard, 1791.

For the first seven species of *Monoculus*, Linnaeus gave references to publications, usually quoting figures, and from these figures and the description in the text we are certain to what animals the names apply. But species Nos. 8 and 9 cannot immediately be recognised from their descriptions and for each of them Linnaeus gave only a reference to one person. These were, for species No. 8, Uddman, a pupil of his, studying in Finland, and, for species No. 9, E. Brander, the Swedish consul at Algiers; presumably they had sent him the specimens.

Species No. 8, *Monoculus lenticularis*, is difficult to recognise from its short description in 1758 in the *Systema Naturae*, but this description was improved in 1761 by the addition of the word "pellucida" in the Second Edition of the *Fauna Svecica* (: 499). Hermann (1804) thought that his *Daphnia gigas* might be *Monoculus lenticularis*. Brongniard (1820) named the same animal *Limnadia hermanni*. Lilljeborg (1871) was sure that these animals, since they occur in Sweden, were *Monoculus lenticularis*, because there is no other flat and pellucid species of this kind in that country. Sahlberg (1875) pointed out that, as it is also found in Finland, it must be the Linnean species. It is now called *Limnadia lenticularis* (Linnaeus).

Species No. 9, *Monoculus Telemus*, is a pteropod mollusc belonging to the genus *Cavolina* Abildgaard, 1791. Telemus was a soothsayer in Homer's "Odyssey". The species is today called *Cavolina tridentata* (Forskål). Davila (1767, vol. 1, plate 20 figs. D and E) figured the shell. Forskål (1775, *Descr. Anim.*: 124) described it as *Anomia tridentata*. Abildgaard (1791) named it *Cavolina natans*, because Cavolini of Naples had told him how this animal swims; he referred to Davila. Hermann (1804) recognised that the species described by Davila, Forskål and Abildgaard corresponds to *Monoculus Telemus* Linnaeus. I have been able to confirm this from a handwritten entry by Linnaeus in his copy of the 12th Edition of the *Systema Naturae* (1767), now in the library of the Linnean Society of London, which refers to the plate and figures of Davila. Philippi (1853) renamed the genus *Cavolinia*, but there is no justification for this. No advantage of any kind would be served by the re-introduction of the trivial name *telemus* Linnaeus, 1758, for this species, in place of the well-known trivial name *tridentata* Forskål, 1775, by which it has been known continuously for nearly 150 years. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *telemus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Monoculus telemus*) and, having done so, (i) to place that trivial name on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, and (ii) to place the trivial name *tridentata* Forskål, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Anomia tridentata*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

While the nine species of *Monoculus* are now placed in nine other genera, the Linnean genus itself is still nomenclatorially available and every one of the generic names at present used for the nine species is liable to be superceded if one or other of those species were to be selected as the type species of *Monoculus* Linnaeus. This is highly undesirable, since the generic names in question have come to be very well known to zoologists. One of these names, *Limulus* Müller, has indeed already been placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. I accordingly apply herewith to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suppress the name *Monoculus* Linnaeus, 1758, under its plenary powers, on the grounds that reintroduction of this name would clearly lead to greater confusion than uniformity, and, having done so, to place this name on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

References

- Abildgaard, P. E., 1791. "Nyere Efterretning om det Skaldyr fra Middelhavet, som Forskål har beskrevet under Navn af *Anomia tridentata*." *Skr. naturhist. Selsk.*, Copenhagen 1: 171.
- Brongniard, A., 1820. "Mémoire sur la Limnadia." *Mém. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris* 6: 83.
- Davila (1767). *Catalogue systématique et raisonné des curiosités de la Nature et de l'art qui composent le cabinet de M. Davila*, Paris.
- Forskål, P. (1775). *Descriptiones Animalium*, Copenhagen.

- Hermann, J. F., (1804). *Mémoire apterologique*, Strassburg.
- Leach, W. E. (1819). "Entomostracés" in *Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles* 14.
- Lilljeborg, W. (1871). "*Limnadia gigas* (J. F. Hermann) förekommande i Sverige." *Ofvers. Vetensk. Akad. Stockh.* 28: 823.
- Müller, O. F. (1776). *Zoologiae danicae Prodromus*, Copenhagen.
- Müller, O. F. (1785). *Entomostraca, seu Insecta Testacea*, Leipzig and Copenhagen.
- Philippi, R. A. (1853). *Handbuch der Conchyliologie und Malacozoologie*, Halle.
- Sahlberg, J. R. (1875). "Om Finlands hiltills kända phyllopodet och återfinnandet af Linnés *Monoculus lenticularis*." *Faun. Flor. Fenn. Notiser*, Helsingfors.

PROPOSAL THAT THE GENERIC NAME "RANTUS" DEJEAN, 1833 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA) SHOULD BE EMENDED TO "RHANTUS" UNDER ARTICLE 19 AND THAT THE TYPE SPECIES OF THIS GENUS SHOULD BE DETERMINED UNDER THE PROCEDURE LAID DOWN FOR DEALING WITH GENERA BASED UPON MISIDENTIFIED TYPE SPECIES

By J. BALFOUR-BROWNE, M.A.

(Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History),
London)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)171)

I originally submitted the present proposal to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the purpose of securing authority for the retention of the spelling *Rhantus* for the well-known coleopterous genus concerned, notwithstanding the fact that as originally published by Dejean in 1833, this name was spelt "Rantus." At the time when I submitted this application (April 1940), it was impossible for the Commission to take decisions on new cases, and I realised that considerable delay would be inevitable. Later, a second element entered into this case, when it was realised that under a strict interpretation of the expression "indication", as given in the Commission's *Opinion* 1, it would be necessary to review the literature for the purpose of determining the place where this generic name was first published. This particular difficulty disappeared in 1948 as the result of the decision of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, to liberalise the provisions of Proviso (a) to Article 25, and to cancel the relevant portion of the *Opinion* referred to above (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 78-80). Finally, it was found that, when the generic name *Rantus* was published at what is now seen to be the first occasion on which this name appeared in the literature, in conditions which satisfy the provisions of Article 25, the genus so named was based upon a misidentified type species. In order that this matter also may be placed on a satisfactory footing, it is necessary to ask the Commission to give a ruling regarding the type species of this genus under the clarified and amended rules for dealing with genera based upon misidentified type species, laid down by the International Congress of Zoology in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 158-159).

In the circumstances I have redrafted my application, in order both to take account of the decisions taken by the Paris Congress and to include within its scope, each of the three problems involved. I deal with these separately in turn, in the following paragraphs.

(1) Author and date of publication of the name "Rantus"

The generic name *Rantus* first appeared in print in 1833 in Dejean's *Cat. Coleopt* (ed. 2): 54. It was there attributed to Eschscholtz, by whom presumably it had been originally suggested in manuscript. Dejean cited four

species as belonging to this genus and for three of them cited what he regarded as synonyms. In all, he cited under this generic name eight trivial names previously validly published for nominal species. He did not give any verbal diagnosis for this genus, nor did he designate or indicate a type species. Nevertheless, under the liberalisation of the definition of the expression "indication" adopted by the Paris Congress, the name *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, satisfies the requirements of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* and accordingly possesses rights under the Law of Priority. It is not a homonym of any previously published generic name consisting of the same word, and it is therefore an available name. Further, it is the oldest available generic name for the group of species associated with the species, hitherto recognised as the type species of the genus concerned.

(2) Type species of the genus "*Rantus*" Dejean, 1833

The first author to select a type species for the genus *Rantus* Dejean was Hope, who in 1839 (*Col. Mon.*, 2: 131) selected what he called "*Dytiscus pulverosus* Knoch" as the type species of this genus, which however, he attributed to Eschscholtz, by whom (as shown above), this name was originally proposed in manuscript. Knoch never published the name *Dytiscus pulverosus* but there is no doubt that the species to which Hope was referring when he made the foregoing type selection was the species which in 1825, Stephens had named *Colymbetes pulverosus* (Stephens, 1825, *Cat.*: 49 no. 489), for when dealing with the same species in 1828 (*Ill. Brit. Ent. Mand.* 2: 69), Stephens added the following synonymy for this species: "*Dy. pulverosus* Knoch—*Co. pulverosus* Steph. Catal., p. 49, No. 489." This species, as I have shown (1939, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) 3: 109) is the same as that to which MacLeay in 1825 (*Annul. javan.* (ed. 1): 135) gave the name *Colymbetes suturalis*. On the basis of the foregoing identification, the oldest available trivial name for the species selected as the type species of *Rantus* by Hope in 1838 is *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825.

The generic name *Rantus* is universally interpreted in the sense indicated by Hope's type selection, but, before we can accept that as a valid type selection, it is necessary that we should satisfy ourselves that the species selected by Hope was in fact one of Dejean's originally included species. It is at this point that difficulties begin to arise. The trivial names cited by Dejean under the generic name *Rantus* are as follows:—

1. *notatus* Fabr.
Synonyms: *conspersus* Gyll.
pulverosus Knoch
2. *agilis* Fabr.
Synonym: *suturalis* Harr. [recte *suturellus* Harr.]
3. *adspersus* Fabr.
Synonym: *collaris* Gyll.
4. *suturalis* Dejean (a new name)
Synonym: *notatus* Gyll.

It will be seen from the foregoing list that Dejean did include in his genus *Rantus*, a species having the trivial name *pulverosus*, attributed by him to Knoch (doubtless for the same reasons as those explained above in connection with Hope's 1839 type selection) and doubtless denoting the species named *Colymbetes pulverosus* by Stephens in 1825. This nominal species (as already explained) and also that referred to by Dejean as "*conspersus* Gyll." (= *Dytiscus conspersus* Gyllenhal, 1808, *Ins. suec.* 1:482 (*nec.* Marsham, 1802)), are currently regarded as identical with the species represented by *Colymbetes suturalis* MacLeay, 1825; but, contrary to the view expressed in Dejean's *Catalogue*, the species so named is considered to be quite distinct from the species cited by Dejean as *Rantus notatus* Fabr. Dejean was doubtless referring to *Dytiscus notatus* as published by Fabricius in 1781 (*Spec. Ins.* 1:296), where, however, Fabricius did not publish this as a new name, the name in question having already been published by Bergstrasser in 1778 (*Nomencl. Ins. Hanau* 1:31).

It is, however, not now accepted by specialists that the species referred to *Dytiscus* by Gyllenhal, 1808, under the trivial name *notatus*, is the same species as *Dytiscus notatus* Bergstrasser, 1778; on the other hand, it is accepted that the species so referred to by Gyllenhal is the same species as that referred to by Fabricius in 1781, as *Dytiscus notatus*. It is now considered by specialists that Fabricius misidentified the *Dytiscus notatus* of Bergstrasser (which is now considered to be the same species as *Dytiscus nebulosus* Forster, 1771, *Nov. Spec. Ins.* 1:56) and that Gyllenhal followed Fabricius in this misidentification. Accordingly, the species possessing the misapplied name *Dytiscus notatus* Fabricius, 1781 (*nec Dytiscus notatus* Bergstrasser, 1778), is now referred to as *Rantus frontalis* (Marsham, 1802) (= *Dytiscus frontalis* Marsham, 1802), the name *frontalis* Marsham being the earliest available name for the species (*vide* Balfour-Browne (J.), 1944, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) 11:354). Since Dejean listed as distinct species (1) *notatus* Gyllenhal (a preoccupied name which he proposed to replace by the name *suturalis* Dejean (not *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825) and (2) *notatus* Fabricius (with synonyms *conspersus* Gyllenhal and *pulverosus* Knoch), it is perfectly clear that he misconceived the Fabrician species and that the species which he identified as *notatus* Fabricius is not that species but *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825 (= *pulverosus* (Knoch MS.) Stephens, 1828).

Two conclusions emerge from the data summarised above: (a) that the species *Colymbetes pulverosus* (Knoch MS.) Stephens, 1825, selected as the type species of *Rantus* (Eschscholtz MS.) Dejean by Hope in 1839, is a species which, under the decision taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4:177-180), is to be treated as having been originally included in the genus, and therefore that Hope's selection of this species as the type species of the genus *Rantus*, being the first such selection to be made, is valid under the *Règles*; (b) that Dejean, in identifying the above species with *Dytiscus notatus* Fabricius, 1781, committed an error of identification and therefore that, as the above species was later validly selected to be the type species of this genus (by Hope in 1839),

the genus *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, is a genus based upon a misidentified type species.

The position of a genus established on a misidentified type species (which already had been the subject of *Opinions* 65 and 169) was reviewed by the Commission and the Congress in 1948, when it was agreed that, where the Commission was satisfied that such an error had been committed by the original author of a genus, it should use its plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus concerned, the species intended by the original author of the genus (or, if the identity of that species was doubtful, some other species in harmony with current nomenclatorial usage) but that, where the Commission was of the opinion that greater confusion than uniformity would result from using the plenary powers in this way, it should direct that the designation or indication, or, as the case might be, selection as the type species of the genus concerned, of the species cited by the original author of the genus be accepted (1950. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 158-159). When we consider the present case in the light of the foregoing decision, it is immediately apparent that greater confusion than uniformity would result if the Commission were to use its plenary powers to designate as the type species of the genus *Rantus* Dejean the nominal species "*Rantus notatus* Fabr.," with which Dejean synonymised the nominal species *Colymbetess pulverosus* Stephens, 1825, for such a type designation would run entirely counter to the currently accepted treatment of this genus. It follows therefore that the present case is one which should be dealt with under the second part of the decision summarised above. I accordingly ask the Commission to direct that, notwithstanding the error of identification committed by Dejean at the time (1833) when he published the generic name *Rantus*, the nominal species *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, included by him in this genus and (in 1839) selected by Hope, as the type species of this genus, is to be accepted as such.

(3) The question whether the name "*Rantus*" Dejean, 1833, should be emended to "*Rhantus*" under Article 19

The name *Rantus* was published by Dejean in 1833, without any indication of the origin of the word so selected. Thirteen years later Agassiz (1846, *Nomencl. zool. Index univ.*: 321) pointed out that the correct orthography of the Greek word ῥαντός, when transliterated into the Latin alphabet, was not "*rantus*" but "*rhantus*," and he accordingly emended the spelling of this generic name to *Rhantus*. This emended spelling has ever since been generally adopted; in 1935 however, F. Balfour-Browne restored the original spelling (*Rantus*), arguing that no emendation of a generic name should be accepted "unless made by the original author and within the same volume of the publication in which the original spelling appeared." The question of the interpretation of Article 19 of the *Règles* was, I am aware, carefully considered by the Commission and the Congress in Paris in 1948, when certain clarifications were agreed upon and arrangements made for a comprehensive review of the problems involved in the emendation of names to be carried out by the Secretary to the Commission, in consultation with interested

specialists, with a view to a thorough-going clarification of Article 19 at the next (Copenhagen, 1953) meeting of the Congress (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 141-144). It is quite clear from the decisions taken in Paris that the grounds on which F. Balfour-Browne (1935) sought to justify the abandonment of the long established spelling *Rhantus*, in favour of the original spelling *Rantus*, are invalid, because not in accordance with the *Règles*. In view of the ambiguity of the wording of Article 19 (and, in particular, the absence of guidance as to how to interpret the governing word, "évident"), it is possible that for other reasons the emendation of the name *Rantus* to *Rhantus* is not justified under the provisions of this Article. In any case, there can clearly be no finality in this matter until the Commission has given a definite ruling one way or the other.

When I originally raised this question with the Commission (April, 1940) I did so because my correspondent Dr. Hugh B. Leach (Vernon, B.C.), had drawn my attention to the fact that in the then recently published Fourth Supplement to the Leng Catalogue of the Coleoptera of North America North of Mexico, Dr. R. E. Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.), had used the accustomed spelling "*Rhantus*," notwithstanding the paper published in 1935 referred to above. At the same time, Dr. Leach sent me an extract from a letter which he had received from Dr. Blackwelder, which reads as follows: "*Rantus* and *Dytiscus* do come under Article 19, in my opinion, but each not as a *lapsus calami* but as an error of transcription. The reasons given by Balfour-Browne for not accepting the corrections seem to me to have no basis in the Rules, or in our attempts to get a stable nomenclature. And this in spite of the fact that I do not hesitate to back any change that seems necessary. There is nothing in the Rules that requires that corrections of original spellings must be made by the original author or within a set period of time, but the Appendix to the Rules does indicate that the proper way to transliterate *Rantus* from the Greek is *Rhantus*." It was because I agreed with Dr. Blackwelder that the emended spelling (*Rhantus*) ought to be retained in this case, that I then asked the Commission to give a ruling in this sense. I am still of the opinion that nothing but unnecessary confusion and instability would result from the reversion from the spelling *Rhantus* to the original but defective spelling *Rantus*, and I accordingly ask the Commission to rule that under Article 19 the emended spelling *Rhantus* is to be accepted and therefore that this genus should be known as *Rhantus* (emend. of *Rantus*) Dejean, 1833.

Recommendation submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In the light of the considerations advanced in the present application, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:—

- (1) to give a ruling that the genus *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, is based upon a misidentified type species, since *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, which was selected as its type species by Hope in 1839, is not, as erroneously stated by Dejean, the same species as that which he called *Rantus notatus* Fabr. (i.e., *notatus* Bergstrasser, 1778);

that greater confusion than uniformity would result if the species with which Dejean misidentified *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, were now to be designated under the plenary powers as the type species of the genus *Rantus* Dejean; and therefore that the species *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, is to be accepted as the type species of this genus;

- (2) to declare that under Article 19 the spelling of the generic name published by Dejean in 1833 is to be emended from *Rantus* to *Rhantus*;
- (3) to place the generic name *Rhantus* (emend. of *Rantus*) Dejean, 1833 (type species, by selection by Hope, 1839: *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*;
- (4) to place the trivial name *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbetes suturalis*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

**PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS
OF THE NAMES "ACANTHOLYDA" COSTA, 1894 (CLASS
INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA) AND "ACANTHOC-
NEMA" BECKER, 1894 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)**

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.

(*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)175)

In 1859 A. Costa in O. Costa, *Fauna Regno Napoli*, Imen. 3, Lididei : 2, described a genus *Acanthocnema* without any included species. In 1894 in *Prosp. Im. Ital.* : 232, he emended the name to *Acantholyda*. There is no possible doubt that *Acantholyda* was meant to replace *Acanthocnema* because there is only one group in the family LYDIDAE (now known as PAMPHILIIDAE) in which the key character used, the presence of a pre-apical fore-tibial spine, is present. The name *Acantholyda* Costa, 1894, has been in general use in the Order Hymenoptera now for about 30 years, and the group to which it is attached contains a number of forestry pests in the Old and New Worlds and occurs frequently in economic literature.

The name *Acanthocnema* Costa, 1859, on the other hand, has been entirely overlooked in the Order Hymenoptera and has never been used since its inception. Furthermore, Becker, 1894, *Berlin. ent. Z.* **39** : 136, gave the name *Acanthocnema* to a valid genus of CORDYLURIDAE (Order Diptera) and the name is at present in use in that Order.

The strict application of the *Règles* in this case would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, since it would involve the transfer of the well-known name *Acanthocnema* from the Order Diptera to the Order Hymenoptera. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are accordingly asked to use their plenary powers to suppress the name *Acanthocnema* Costa, 1859, and to validate the names *Acantholyda* Costa, 1894 (Order Hymenoptera) and *Acanthocnema* Becker, 1894 (Order Diptera). At the same time the International Commission are asked to place the above names, so validated, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The gender of the name *Acantholyda* Costa is feminine, as also is that of *Acanthocnema* Becker. The type species of the first of these genera is *Tenthredo erythrocephala* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 558, that species having been so selected by Rohwer in "The Genotypes of the Sawflies and Woodwasps, or the Super-Family Tenthredinoidea," published in 1911 (*Tech. Ser. U.S. Bur. Ent.* **20** : 73). The type species of *Acanthocnema* Becker, 1894, is *Cordylura nigrimana* Zetterstedt, 1846, *Dipt. Scand.* **5** : 2040, by original designation. The foregoing names are regarded as being the oldest available names for the species concerned and it is accordingly proposed that the trivial name *erythrocephala* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Tenthredo erythrocephala*) and the trivial name *nigrimana* Zetterstedt, 1846 (as published in the binominal combination *Cordylura nigrimana*) should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*. Finally, on the suppression of the name *Acanthocnema* Costa, 1859, that name should be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAMES "RHINA" LATREILLE, [1802-1803], AND "MAGDALIS" GERMAR, 1817, FOR USE RESPECTIVELY IN THE ACCUSTOMED SENSE (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By J. CHESTER BRADLEY

(Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)202)

In "An XI" of the French Revolutionary calendar (September 1802–September 1803), Latreille published the generic name *Rhina* (*Hist. Nat. Gen. part. Crust. Ins.* 3:198), (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). Latreille cited two species under this generic name, the second with a query. The species so cited were: "*Curculio barbicornis* F." and "*Curculio cerasi* ? F."

Since Latreille did not at that time designate or indicate a type species and his second species is excluded as a possible type species under Rule (e), (γ) in Article 30 of the Code, the type species of this genus is *barbicornis* Fabricius, by monotypy. But the name "*barbicornis* F." applied by Latreille to that species, was a *lapsus calami* for "*barbirostris* F.", as is proven by the following considerations.

Fabricius in 1775 (*Syst. Ent.*:134) described one species under the name *Curculio barbicornis* and on the following page (:135) a second species under the name *Curculio barbirostris*. Of *C. barbicornis* he says amongst other things: "Rostrum corpore longius . . . Antennae . . . filiformes, hirtae, articulis undecim cylindricis versus apicem rostri insertae . . .". But Latreille, when publishing the generic name *Rhina*, wrote of the species which he then mistakenly called "*barbicornis* F.": "Trompe de la longueur de la moitié du corps . . . le huitième article des antennes formant la massue". Under the generic description Latreille wrote: "Antennes insérées vers le milieu des côtés de la trompe".

	<i>barbicornis</i> F.	<i>barbicornis</i> Latreille
Rostrum	as long as body	one half as long as body
Antennae	filiform	with a club
:	of eleven segments	of eight segments
:	inserted towards the apex of the beak	inserted towards the middle of the beak

The nominal species *Curculio barbirostris* Fabricius is ordinarily identified with a very large common Neotropical weevil with which the description given by Fabricius agrees in all respects, including such conspicuously characteristic matters as the bearded beak (but this is sexual) and the tridentate anterior femora. The characters given by Latreille for "*barbicornis* F.", although not in all respects those mentioned by Fabricius for *C. barbirostris*, agree perfectly

with the insect itself, including the statement made in the generic description in regard to the antennae: "le huitième ou neuvième article paroissant former à lui seul une massue tres-allongé, ellipsoide".

The nominal species *Curculio barbicornis* Fabricius, 1775, is ordinarily identified with a large and common New Zealand species of BRENTIDAE now placed in the genus *Lasiorrhynchus* Dejean.

It seems clearly apparent that Latreille, confused by the two similar Fabrician names appearing on facing pages of the same work, simply wrote "*barbicornis* F." when he meant "*barbirostris* F."

In volume 2 of his *Histoire naturelle des Crustacés et des Insectes* (1804: 101) Latreille wrote further of his genus *Rhina*. In volume 3 he had been giving a synopsis of the genera with brief mention of species. In volume 11 he treated each genus more fully. He now dwelt upon the essential characters of the genus *Rhina* and there again included two species, which I believe he meant to be the same two; but he rectified his error in regard to the name of the first, which he now called *Rhina barbirostris*, citing as a synonym *Lixus barbirostris* F. (but making no mention of the fact that he himself had previously called it *barbicornis*). In the meanwhile he had evidently realised that his second species was not *cerasi* F. and rechristened it *Rhina barbicornis*. (Authors currently list both *barbicornis* Latreille and *cerasi* F. in the same genus but as distinct species.) But the species which Latreille now called *Rhina barbicornis* was a totally different *barbicornis* from *Curculio barbicornis* Fabricius; in the light of current knowledge it is a well-known European species of the genus *Magdalis* Germar, 1817, which is now also adventive in North America, and a species of some economic importance.

Latreille in 1810 (*Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.*: 431) cited "*Lixus barbirostris* F." as the type species of *Rhina*, without mentioning other species.

Current usage (e.g., Csiki, *Coleopt. Catalogus* **149**: 87, published in 1936) employs the name *Rhina* as though *C. barbirostris* F. were the type species, although there has been some attempt to make it replace the *Magdalis*, the type genus of the sub-family MAGDALINAE, which it could only do if the second species (first called by Latreille "*cerasi* ? F." and later named by that author *barbicornis* as a new species) were the type species.

The method to be pursued in determining the type species of a nominal genus, which, as in the present case, was based upon a misidentified type species, has twice in the past been the subject of rulings by the Commission (in *Opinions* 65 and 168 respectively) and in 1948 was further clarified by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, which agreed to the insertion in the *Règles* of an express provision on this subject. This new provision makes it clear that an author who publishes a name for a genus is "to be assumed to have identified correctly the nominal species referred by him to the genus so named and therefore that, where . . . the original author himself designates or indicates or the same or some other author later selects one of

the originally included nominal species to be the type species of the genus, the designation, indication or, as the case may be, the selection so made, is not to be rejected on the ground that the original author misidentified some other nominal species with that nominal species, but that, where there are grounds for considering that such a species had been misidentified by the original author of the genus, the case is to be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, which, if satisfied that the species in question had been so misidentified, is, under its plenary powers, to designate as the type species of the genus concerned, either (a) the species intended by the original author when citing the name of the erroneously determined species, or (b), if the identity of that species is doubtful, a species in harmony with current usage" (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 158-159), except in cases where the Commission considers that greater confusion than uniformity would result from so doing. In the present case I have shown both that the species indicated by Latreille as the type species was a species which, as the result (as I believe) of a *lapsus calami*, was a misidentified species, and also that the species which Latreille intended to include in the genus *Rhina*, when he cited the name "*barbicornis* F." was the species *Curculio barbirostris* Fabricius, 1775. I have further shown that the genus *Rhina* Latreille is interpreted as though Latreille had in fact cited *C. barbirostris* Fabricius as an included species and that great confusion would result if, under a strict interpretation of the *Règles*, it were necessary now to accept *Curculio barbicornis* Fabricius, 1775, as the type species of this genus. I accordingly ask the International Commission to apply to this case the procedure agreed upon in Paris, by using their plenary powers to designate *Curculio barbirostris* Fabricius, 1775, as the type species of the genus *Rhina* Latreille [1802-1803].

Prior to the Paris Congress of 1948, the availability of the name *Rhina barbicornis* Latreille, 1804 (which, as I have explained, applies to a well-known species of the genus *Magdalis*) would have been a matter of doubt, for it might have been held that this name was invalid on account of secondary homonymy, owing to the prior (inadvertent) use by Latreille in 1802-1803 of the same binominal combination for the species, the true name of which is *Curculio barbirostris* Fabricius, 1775. Under the Paris decisions (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 118-125) a name is not to be rejected on the ground of secondary homonymy if the two species concerned are no longer regarded as congeneric and if, during the period when they were regarded as belonging to the same genus, no author replaced the later published of the two names in question. Under this decision the new name *Rhina barbicornis* Latreille, 1804 (which belongs to the species now regarded as referable to the genus *Magdalis*) is not invalidated by the prior use by Latreille of the same binominal combination for *Curculio barbirostris* Fabricius, as it was never replaced on the ground that it was a secondary homonym by any author who considered the two species congeneric. In order, however, to underline the fact that the trivial name *barbicornis* Latreille, 1804 (as published in the binominal combination *Rhina barbicornis*) is an available name, it is desirable that this trivial name should now be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

Although, as explained, the generic name *Rhina* Latreille [1802-1803], is in general use, it has in the past been suggested that it was invalid, on the ground that it was a junior homonym of *Rhina* Schæffer, 1760, and of *Rhina* Wahlbaum, 1792 (in a reprint of Klein, 1744), both of which are names which have been applied to genera of fish. It was for this reason that Rafinesque in 1815 (*Analyse*: 165) replaced the name *Rhina* Latreille by the substitute name *Rinostomus*. Rafinesque was, however, mistaken in rejecting the name *Rhina* Latreille, which is not a homonym of any available name of older date and is perfectly valid. Of the two names, by which it was alleged that Latreille's name *Rhina* was preoccupied, the first, *Rhina* Schæffer, 1760, was examined by the late President David Starr Jordan (1917, *Genera of Fishes*) and rejected as having been published by a non-binominal author, while the second, *Rhina* Wahlbaum, 1792, is unavailable nomenclatorially under the decision in the Commission's *Opinion* 21 that Wahlbaum's reissue of Klein's pre-1758 work does not confer availability on the names published therein.

In view of the decision taken by the Commission in 1948 that in future *Opinions* should deal fully with all aspects of the problem under consideration (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 355), coupled with the instruction given to the Commission by the Congress to foster the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 267-269), I recommend that, at the same time that the generic name *Rhina* Latreille is placed on the *Official List*, there should be added thereto also the name *Magdalis* Germar, 1817, owing to the connection of that generic name with the present case through the name *Rhina barbicornis* Latreille, 1804, the name of a species currently referred to Germar's genus. (It may be noted that, prior to the Paris Congress, this well-known name, *Magdalis*, would have been considered as having been first established by Samouelle in 1819, with the definitely designated type species *Curculio aterrimus* Fabricius, 1775, since Germar in 1817 published it without any definition or description, but with included nominal species, none of which was designated or indicated as the type species. Under the liberalisation of the expression "indication" in proviso (a) to Article 25 then agreed to (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 78-80), the name *Magdalis* Germar, 1817, acquired availability as of that date.)

Type Species of *Magdalis* Germar, 1817

The name *Magdalis* was first used by Germar in 1817 (*Mag. Ent.* **2**: 140). No description was given and no indication except that three nominal species were included: "*Rhynch. Pruni, violaceus, aterrimus*". No authors' names were mentioned and no bibliographical references given. "*Rhynch.*" is an abbreviation of the Fabrician generic name *Rhynchaenus*.

The following question arises: Since Germar, 1817, in giving the specific names *Rhynch. aterrimus*, etc., to the species that he included in his new genus *Magdalis*, failed to cite the authors of those names and gave no bibliographical clue to what species were meant, (a) did he fail to establish *Magdalis* or (b) can the species named be accepted as those, if any, that at the time of his writing bore or had borne those complete specific names (i.e., generic and

specific name) ?*

If the answer to (a) were to be "yes", then *Magdalis* was not established by Germar, 1817, nor by Samouelle, 1819, since neither gave the author's name nor any bibliographical reference to the trivial name or names. In that case the genus was established by Germar in *Neue Annalen Wetterauische Gesellsch. für die gesamte Naturkunde zu Hanau* 4:130. Germar here included:—

- (1) *M. violacea* Fbr., Linn., Rossi, Pzr., Payk., Laich., DeGeer, Hrbst.
- (2) *M. nassata* (descr. follows) "Ob sie vielleicht *Rhynch. carbonarius* Fabr. ist?"
- (3) *M. duplicata* (descr. follows) "Vielleicht *Curculio cerasi* L. und vielleicht auch *Curculio cerasi* Hrbst., Payk. (mas)".
- (4) *M. aterrima* Fbr., Hrbst., Oliv.
- (5) *M. cerasi* Fbr., Clairv., Hrbst. (fem.).
- (6) *M. Lymexylon* Fbr., Panz., Payk., Hrbst.

No type species was either designated or indicated.

The first type selection known to me was by Schoenherr in 1823 (*Isis* (Oken) 2:1136), who there proposed *Thamnophilus* as a substitute name for *Magdalis*, designated *Rhynch. violaceus* auct. as type species and therefore *ipso facto* made it also the type species of *Magdalis*.

If, on the other hand (as appears inevitable from reasons stated in the preceding footnote), the answer to (b) is "yes", then it becomes necessary to ascertain whether any or all of three nominal species bearing the names "*Rhynch.*" (i.e., *Rhynchaenus*) "*Pruni.*, *violaceus* and *aterrimus*" stood in the genus *Rhynchaenus* in the year 1817 or had earlier been placed in it. We need here only consider *aterrimus*. In *Syst. Eleuth.* (2:486), Fabricius transferred *Curculio aterrimus* (see 1792, *Ent. Syst.* 1:439, No. 189) to *Rhynchaenus*. This was the species which Germar meant by "*Rhynch. aterrimus*" in 1817, a fact which he himself corroborated in 1819 by giving a reference to Fabricius as the first authority cited after his "*Magdalis aterrima*".

If, therefore, citation of "*Rhynch. aterrimus*" and others is accepted as adequate to validate the publication of the generic name *Magdalis*, and it is apparent that it must be, then Samouelle in 1819 validly selected the originally

* The answer to this question seems to be explicit in the action taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at Paris in 1948 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4:80, concl. 13, par. 1). "A generic name published before 1st January, 1931, shall be available (under Art. 25) . . . when the name, on being first published, was accompanied by no verbal definition or description, the only indication given being that provided by the citation under the generic . . . name concerned of the names of one or more previously published nominal species." Since the only requirement is the name of the species, the name of the author is not required and equally no other bibliographic reference,

included species *R. aterrimus* as its type species.*

The identity of *Rhynchaenus aterrimus*

Schenkling in the *Coleopterorum Catalogus* and other authors attribute *Magdalis aterrima* to Fabricius. But Fabricius never had any intention of establishing a new species under that name, and no act of his could be construed as doing so. He first mentioned *aterrimus* as a species of *Curculio* in 1792 (*Ent. Syst.* **2**: 439, No. 189), but in doing so cited *Curculio aterrimus* Linnaeus, *Syst. naturae* and *Fauna suecica*. In 1801 (*Syst. Eleuth.* **2**: 486, No. 225) he transferred *Curculio aterrimus* Linnaeus to his new genus *Rhynchaenus*, citing *Curculio aterrimus* by name, and giving a reference to his own *Ent. syst.* as well as both the Linnean references above mentioned.

Consequently, only one species has been established, namely, *Curculio aterrimus* Linnaeus, changed in 1801 to *Rhynchaenus aterrimus* (Linnaeus) (Fabricius) and in 1817 to *Magdalis aterrima* (Linnaeus) (Germar).

While I am not familiar with the taxonomy of these beetles, and have no basis for a subjective opinion as to what actual species Linnaeus meant by *Curculio aterrimus*, it is clear that coleopterists are in doubt. This is evident from the fact that Schenkling (*Catalogus Coleopterorum* **29** (pt. 141): 12) refers under *Magdalis* to "*aterrima* Fabricius" (as a synonym of *armigera* Geoff., 1785), but gives no reference to *aterrimus* Linnaeus, and that Wagner (*loc. cit.* **28** (pt. 6): 40) cites *Curculio aterrimus* Linnaeus as a synonym of *Apion marchicum* Herbst. He does not query the synonymy, but since *Curculio aterrimus* Linnaeus is the older name, he either was sufficiently in doubt about the identification to be unwilling to use it to replace *marchicum*, or else he simply disregarded priority in order to avoid overthrowing that name.

The general presumption in all such cases is that Fabricius correctly identified *Curculio aterrimus* Linnaeus when he transferred it to *Rhynchaenus*, and that therefore Germar really meant *Curculio aterrimus* in the sense of Linnaeus when he cited *Rhynch. aterrimus* as one of the three original species of *Magdalis*. Nevertheless, in view of the strong probability that they actually were misidentifying the Linnean species, it seems appropriate that the Commission, acting under their plenary powers, as directed at the Paris Session, should set aside the selection by Samouelle, 1819, of *Curculio aterrimus* Linnaeus as type species of *Magdalis*, and all other selections (if any) prior to 1823,

* Samouelle, George. The Entomologists' useful compendium, 1919, p. 204. "In . . . Germar's and Zincker Sommer's Magazin der Entomologie, v. 111 [*sic*!; should read 11] for 1817, notice is given of the following genera lately established (the species mentioned may be considered the types).

"Genus *Magdalis* Germar. Sp. 1. *aterrimus*."

(Then followed eight more genera, in one or two instances, two species being mentioned under each).

In the two cases where Samouelle named two species, he did not effect a type-selection. In the other cases he certainly did, under even the most rigorous construction.

and should validate the selection of *Curculio violaceus* Linnaeus, 1758, by Schoenherr in 1823 in *Isis von Oken* (2 : 1136) as type species not only of *Thamnophilus*, which was there proposed as a substitute for *Magdalis* Germar, but also *ipso facto*, as type species of *Magdalis*.

It will be noted that *Curculio violaceus* Linnaeus is one of the three species originally included in *Magdalis*, that it was treated as type species of the subgenus *Magdalis* by Daniel in his revision of the subgenera, 1903, and is included in that subgenus by Schenkling in the *Catalogus Coleopterorum*, but that "*aterrima* L." is placed by Daniel as a synonym of *armigera* Geoffroy and that *Curculio aterrima* Fabricius, treated as a synonym of *armigera*, is placed by Schenkling in another subgenus.* To select *Curculio violaceus* Linnaeus as type species would therefore be to select "a species in harmony with current usage," as the Commission is now directed to do (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 158-159).

In the light of the considerations set out above, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to stabilize the generic names *Rhina* Latreille and *Magdalis* Germar each in its accustomed sense, by using for this purpose their plenary powers to such extent as may be necessary, and, having done so, to place these names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and to take such other consequential action as may be necessary. The proposal which I accordingly submit is that the Commission should :

(1) use their plenary powers

- (a) to set aside all selections of type species for *Rhina* Latreille [1802-1803], and for *Magdalis* Germar, 1817, made prior to the date of the proposed decision ;
- (b) to designate *Curculio barbirostris* Fabricius, 1775, to be the type species of *Rhina* Latreille [1802-1803] ;
- (c) to designate *Curculio violaceus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of *Magdalis* Germar, 1817 ;

(2) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with the type species specified below, together with a note that the gender of the generic names in question is that specified below :

- (a) *Rhina* Latreille, [1802-1803] (type species by designation under the plenary powers under (1) (b) above: *Curculio barbirostris* Fabricius, 1775) (gender of generic name: feminine*) ;

* The subgeneric name "*Magdalinus* Germar" is incorrectly applied to this subgenus. *Magdalinus* was proposed by Germar (in Schoenherr, Gen. Spec. Curc. 7 (2) : 135. footnote) as a substitute for the preoccupied *Thamnophilus*, and therefore has *violacea* as type species. The subgenus in question probably has no valid name.

- (b) *Magdalis* Germar, 1817 (type species by designation under the plenary powers under (1) (c) above: *Curculio violaceus* Linnaeus, 1758) (gender of generic name: feminine*);
- (3) place the under-mentioned invalid or non-existent generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.
- (a) *Rhina* Schæffer, 1760;
 - (b) *Rhina* Wahlbaum, 1792;
 - (c) *Rhinostomus* Rafinesque, 1815;
 - (d) *Thamnophilus* Schoenherr, 1823†;
 - (e) *Magdalinus* Germar, 1843‡;
- (4) place the under-mentioned specific trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*:
- (a) *barbicornis* Latreille, 1804 (as published in the binominal combination *Rhina barbicornis*) (a species now currently placed in *Magdalis* Germar).
 - (b) *barbicornis* Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Curculio barbicornis*) (a species now currently placed in the brentid genus *Lasiorhynchus* Dejean);
 - (c) *barbirostris* Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Curculio barbirostris*) (the type species of *Rhina* Latreille);
 - (d) *violacea* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Curculio violaceus*) (the type species of *Magdalis* Germar).

Postscript. Dated 16th October 1950. (1) The present application was originally submitted in November, 1945; it was "advertised" in November, 1947, as a case possibly involving the use by the Commission of its plenary powers. It was not however, brought before the Commission at its session held in Paris in July, 1948, for it was realized that fresh light had been thrown on some of the issues involved through decisions in regard to the meaning of the *Règles* then taken by the International Congress of Zoology.

* See Annexe.

† *Thamnophilus* was proposed by Schoenherr (1823, Isis von Oken, **2**: col. 1136) as a substitute for *Magdalis* with the specified type species *Curc. violacea* L.

‡ *Magdalinus* was proposed by Germar (in Schoenherr, 1843, Gen. Spec. Curc. **7** (2): 135, footnote) as a substitute name for the pre-occupied *Thamnophilus*.

I have since re-examined this case in the light of the Paris decisions and have accordingly, revised the application to such extent as I have found to be necessary. The revision includes a request for plenary action involving *Magdalis* that was not previously suggested.

(2) I am informed by the Secretary to the Commission that no objection to the use of the plenary powers in the manner proposed in the case of the name *Rhina*, has been lodged, as the result of the "advertisement" of this case made over two years ago. I am confirmed, therefore, in the belief that the action recommended in regard to *Rhina* corresponds with the desires of interested specialists.

Annexe

Gender of *Rhina*

Pliny (32, 11, 53) used the word *rhina* in the feminine gender for a kind of shark. The word was taken over from the Greek feminine noun *ῥινη* (a rasp or file, but also applied to a shark with a rough skin). The gender is therefore clearly feminine.

Gender of *Magdalis*

The gender is feminine, from three considerations:

(1) The name *magdalis* does not occur in that form in either Greek or Latin, except in Greek with the prefix *ἀπο-*

The Greek feminine noun *μαγδαλιά* is a later form of *ἀπομαγδαλιά*. The variant *ἀπομαγδαλς -ίδας* was also used (see Eust. 1857, 17) as a feminine noun.

(2) Greek nouns in *-is* are universally feminine.

(3) Germar in 1919 was the first author to combine trivial names with *Magdalis*. In doing so he placed them all in the feminine gender.

**PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF
GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE NAMES OF
THIRTEEN GENERA IN THE ORDER COLLEMBOLA
(CLASS INSECTA)**

By HERMANN GISIN
(*Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Genève*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)207)

I submit to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the proposal that the under-mentioned thirteen names of genera in the Order Collembola (Class Insecta), should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Each of these names is an available name and has, as its type species, the species specified below, that species having been duly so designated, indicated or selected under the *Règles*. The names now submitted are among the most important and most generally used in the Order Collembola. Each forms the basis, moreover, either of a family or subfamily name.

*Names proposed to be added to the "Official List of Generic
Names in Zoology".*

Actaletes Giard, 1889, *Le Naturaliste* (2) **11** : 123 (type species, by monotypy : *Actaletes neptuni* Giard, 1889, *Le Naturaliste* (2) **11** : 123).

Bourletiella Banks, 1899, *J. N. Y. ent. Soc.* **7** : 194 (type species, by original designation : *Sminthurus hortensis* Fitch, 1863, *8th Ann. Rep. N. Y. agric. Soc.* : 668).

Cyphoderus (emend. of *Cyphodeirus*) Nicolet, 1842, *N. D. Allg. schweiz. Ges.* **6**(3) : 63 (type species, by selection by Börner, 1903 (*S. B. naturf. Fr. Berlin* **1903** : 180) : *Cyphoderus albinus* Nicolet, 1842, *N. D. Allg. schweiz. Ges.* **6**(3) : 67).

Isotoma Bourlet, 1839, *Mém. Soc. R. Sci. Lille* **1839**(1) : 399 (type species, by selection by Börner, 1903 (*S. B. Ges. naturf. Fr. Berlin* **1903** : 171) : *Isotoma viridis* Bourlet, 1839, *Mém. Soc. R. Sci. Lille* **1839**(1) : 401).

Isotomurus Börner, 1903, *S. B. Ges. naturf. Fr. Berlin* **1903** : 171 (type species, by original designation : *Podura palustris* Müller, 1776, *Zool. dan. Prodr.* : 184).

Lepidocyrtus Bourlet, 1839, *Mém. Soc. R. Sci. Lille* **1839**(1) : 391, 392 (type species by monotypy : *Lepidocyrtus curvicolis* Bourlet, 1839, *Mém. Soc. R. Sci. Lille* **1839**(1) : 392).

Neelus Folsom, 1896, *Psyche* **7**: 391 (type species, by monotypy: *Neelus murinus* Folsom, 1896, *Psyche* **7**: 391).

Onychiurus Gervais, 1841, *Echo Monde savant* **8**: 372 (type species, by original designation: *Podura ambulans* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1**: 608).

Orchesella Templeton, 1835, *Trans. ent. Soc. Lond.* **1**(2): 92 (type species, by selection by Börner, 1903 (*S. B. Ges. naturf. Fr. Berlin* **1903**: 180): *Podura cincta* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1**: 609).

Paronella Schött, 1893, *Bih. svensk. VetenskAkad. Handl.*, Stockholm **19**(4) (no. 4): 18 (type species, by monotypy: *Paronella fusca* Schött, 1893, *Bih. svensk. VetenskAkad. Handl.*, Stockholm **19**(4) (No. 4): 18).

Sminthurides Börner, 1900, *Zool. Anz.* **23**: 616 (type species, by selection by Börner, 1906 (*Mitt. naturh. Mus. Hamburg* **23**: 182): *Sminthurus aquaticus* Bourlet, 1842, *Ann. Soc. ent. France* **10**: xli).

Sminthurus (emend. of *Smynthurus*) Latreille, 1802, *Hist. nat. Crust. Ins.* **3**: 72 (type species, by selection by Börner, 1906) *Mitt. naturh. Mus. Hamburg* **23**: 183): *Podura viridis* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1**: 608).

Tullbergia Lubbock, 1876, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (4) **18**: 324 (type species, by monotypy: *Tullbergia antarctica* Lubbock, 1876, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (4) **18**: 324).

I have to add, with reference to the decision by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, that in future the gender of generic names added to the *Official List* is to be specified therein (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 341), that the gender of the words constituting the generic names included in the present application is as follows:—

- (a) *Masculine nouns*: *Actaletes* Giard, 1889; *Cyphoderus* Nicolet, 1842; *Isotomurus* Börner, 1903; *Lepidocyrtus* Bourlet, 1839; *Neelus* Folsom, 1896; *Onychiurus* Gervais, 1841; *Sminthurides* Börner, 1900; *Sminthurus* Latreille, 1802;
- (b) *Feminine nouns*: *Bourletiella* Banks, 1899; *Isotoma* Bourlet, 1839; *Orchesella* Templeton, 1835; *Paronella* Schött, 1893; *Tullbergia* Lubbock, 1876.

In conformity with the decision, taken by the foregoing Congress, when establishing the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 269–271), the adoption of the present proposals relating to the addition of names to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* will involve also the placing of the following specific trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, the names in question being the trivial names of the species which are respectively the type species of the thirteen genera, the names of which it is proposed should be placed on the *Official List*

of *Generic Names in Zoology*. In every case the trivial name concerned is both itself an available name and also the name currently accepted by specialists as the oldest such name for the species concerned.

*Trivial names proposed to be added to the "Official List of
Specific Trivial Names in Zoology"*

albinus Nicolet, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Cythoderus albinus*).

ambulans Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Podura ambulans*).

antarctica Lubbock, 1876 (as published in the binominal combination *Tullbergia antarctica*).

aquaticus Bourlet, 1842 (as published in the binominal combination *Sminthurus aquaticus*).

cincta Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Podura cincta*).

curvicolis Bourlet, 1839 (as published in the binominal combination *Lepidocyrtus curvicolis*).

fusca Schött, 1893 (as published in the binominal combination *Paronella fusca*).

hortensis Fitch, 1863 (as published in the binominal combination *Sminthurus hortensis*).

murinus Folsom, 1896 (as published in the binominal combination *Neelus murinus*).

neptuni Giard, 1889 (as published in the binominal combination *Actaetes neptuni*).

palustris Müller, 1776 (as published in the binominal combination *Podura palustris*).

viridis Bourlet, 1839 (as published in the binominal combination *Isotoma viridis*).

viridis Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Podura viridis*).

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "CARDINIA" (CLASS LAMELLIBRANCHIATA) AS FROM AGASSIZ, [1841], FOR USE IN ITS ACCUSTOMED SENSE

By L. R. COX, Sc.D., F.R.S.

(Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History), London)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)208)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to validate, as from Agassiz [1841], the well-known generic name *Cardinia* in its accustomed sense, i.e., with *Unio listeri* Sowerby (J.), 1817 (*Min. Conch.* **2** : 123) as type species.

The earliest described representatives of this genus were mainly referred by J. Sowerby and other authors to the genus *Unio* Retzius, 1788 (*Diss. nova Test. Gen.* : 16). In 1833 a shell from the Lower Lias of the neighbourhood of Coburg was described by a Dr. Berger (*Neues Jahrb. Min.* **1833** : 69) under the name *Thalassides coburgensis* (gen. et sp. nov.). The description reads as follows : "Sie gehören zu den Dimyarien, und haben eine der Länge nach eiförmige Gestalt. Die äussere Fläche scheint glatt, nur etwa mit Zuwachsstreifen versehen ? An einem Exemplar fand ich an der Stelle des Schlosses ein seichtes Grübchen, während die andern weder Grübchen noch Zahn besitzen. Beiderseits des Schlosses ist ein Seitenzahn. Das randliche Band liegt in einer Vertiefung des Schlossrandes. Die zusammenliegenden Klappen sind nicht klaffend." No figure was given by Berger.

Subsequent authors have recognized that the fossil so named and described was some representative of the genus now known as *Cardinia*, but its specific identity is doubtful and the trivial name *coburgensis* has nowhere been adopted.

The generic name *Cardinia*, now universally employed for the genus typified by *Unio listeri* Sowerby, was first published by Agassiz (I.) in 1838 (*Verh. schweiz. naturf. Ges.* **23** : 104). No species was cited and the genus was merely defined as including "ci-devant *Unio* des terrains secondaires." This cannot be regarded as sufficient to constitute an "indication" for the purposes of Article 25 of the *Règles*. Accordingly, the name *Cardinia* has no status in zoological nomenclature as from Agassiz, 1838.

The name *Cardinia* was next published by F. A. Roemer in 1839 (*Verstein. norddeutsch. Oolithengebirges*, Nachtr. : 38), where the following passage appears immediately after the description of an unfigured species to which was applied the name *Cardita oblecta*, attributed to Goldfuss : "Agassiz bildet aus dieser Art seine Gattung *Cardinia*, und nennt jene *Cardinia sulcata* ; wir haben indessen keine Kennzeichen zu finden vermocht, welche die Trennung der

Gattung verlangen." Goldfuss never described a species under the name *Cardita oblecta*, and this name should therefore be attributed to Roemer. Brauns considered that the species to which Roemer applied this name was identical with *Unio listeri* Sowerby; he was, however, notoriously sweeping in his synonymies and his judgment in this matter cannot be accepted in the absence of supporting evidence from other sources. The name *Cardinia sulcata* referred to by Roemer as having been given by Agassiz was not published by that author until 1843 (*Études crit. Moll. foss.* (3) : 227). The species so named by Agassiz was (like *Cardita oblecta*) regarded by Brauns as identical with *Unio listeri* Sowerby; Brauns accordingly treated the trivial name *sulcata* Agassiz as a junior synonym of *listeri* Sowerby. Although Roemer did not accept the genus *Cardinia* (erected, as he believed, by Agassiz), it could be argued that his use of the name *Cardinia* constituted the establishment of a nominal genus *Cardinia* Roemer with *Cardita oblecta* Roemer as type species, by monotypy. The genus *Cardinia*, so established, would be indeterminate, it being impossible definitely to establish the identity of its type species. The status of the nominal genus *Cardinia* (Agassiz MS.) of Roemer, 1839, is therefore just as unsatisfactory as that of *Thalassides* Berger.

The next occasion on which the name *Cardinia* appeared in print was in the German edition by Agassiz of Sowerby's *Mineral Conchology* (: 58). The exact dates on which the various parts of the German edition were published are not known, but the portion containing page 58 was considered by Sherborn (*Index Anim. Pars secunda* : cxviii) as having been published in 1840. That date is accepted here, though it is possible that the portion in question was not published until 1841. In this work it was suggested that the two Carboniferous species *Unio subconstrictus* Sowerby, 1813, and *Unio acutus* Sowerby, 1813, and the Cornbrash species *Unio uniformis* Sowerby, 1813, should be referred to this genus, "welche ich nach einer liasischen [*?* liasischen] Species desselben Typus aufgestellt habe." The distinctive characters of the hinge were described. The work referred to in the above passage (the *Études crit. Moll. foss.* (3)) in which the genus was founded on Liassic species was at that time still in manuscript. Of the three species cited under the name *Cardinia* in the passage referred to above, the first and second are now referred to the genus *Carbonicola* McCoy, 1855 (in Sedgwick & McCoy, *Synop. Class. brit. palaeozoic Rocks* 2 : 514), and the third to the genus *Pleuromya* Agassiz [1842-1844] (German ed. of Sowerby's *Min. Conch.* : 439). In consequence, the selection of any of these species as the type species of *Cardinia* Agassiz [1840], would be most undesirable and would certainly lead to confusion.

The name *Cardinia* was next published in 1841, again by Agassiz, on page 207 of the same translation of the *Mineral Conchology*. No descriptive remarks were given for the genus, but three species were cited as being referable to it, namely *Unio crassissima* Sowerby, 1817, *Unio listeri* Sowerby, 1817, and *Unio hybrida* Sowerby, 1817. Up to July, 1948, the name *Cardinia* as published by Agassiz in the foregoing manner would, apart from any other consideration, have been invalid, for, being published without a generic diagnosis and without either a designated or indicated type species, it would have been a name published without an "indication" within the meaning of that expression

as used in Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles*. Under a decision taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Paris meeting in July, 1948, the definition of the expression "indication" as applied to generic names published prior to 1st January, 1931, has been liberalised (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 78-80) and in consequence a name such as *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841], now ranks as a name published with an "indication," and, if not invalidated in some other way, such a name is now an available name. Unfortunately, however, as we have seen, the name *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841], is invalid by reason of being a junior homonym of *Cardinia* Roemer, 1839. We may note, however, that if this difficulty were to be overcome by the suppression by the Commission of the name *Cardinia* Roemer, 1839, under its plenary powers, *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841], would become the oldest available generic name objectively available for the genus now universally known as *Cardinia*, provided that *Unio listeri* Sowerby (the second of the species cited by Agassiz) was the type species of this genus; it would still be necessary, however, for the Commission to suppress under its plenary powers all generic names of earlier date that are subjectively identical with *Cardinia* Agassiz, [1841], as defined above, before the name *Cardinia* Agassiz could validly be applied to this genus.

As regards the type species of the genus *Cardinia*, it may be noted that in the year following the second publication of this name by Agassiz in the German edition of the *Mineral Conchology*, an anonymous reviewer, discussing the genus *Cardinia* wrote (1842, *Neues Jahrb. f. Min.* **1842**: 497) wrote "*Unio listeri* Dow. dient am besten als Typus." This observation was made, however, with reference not to Agassiz's use of the name *Cardinia* in the *Mineral Conchology*, but to the use of this name by Strickland (H. E.), when discussing Agassiz's then unpublished *Etudes critiques*, in the Report of the British Association for the year 1842. Under a ruling given by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 348), such action does not constitute the selection of a type species for the nominal genus *Cardinia* Agassiz (that genus not having been under consideration at the time when the anonymous reviewer of Strickland's paper made the foregoing selection (even if the passage quoted above could be regarded as a selection under Rule (g), if "rigidly construed," as required by the *Règles*). Quite apart from the foregoing special considerations relating to the action of the anonymous reviewer of 1842, it cannot be supposed that Agassiz's use of the generic name *Cardinia* on page 207 of the German edition of the *Mineral Conchology* (in a sense not, in his eyes, materially different from the manner in which he had used this name on page 58 of the same work) constitutes the establishment of a new generic name ranking from the later of the two pages cited above. In order to secure such a status for *Cardinia*, as so used, it would be necessary for the Commission to use its plenary powers; similarly, those powers would be needed to provide a type species for this genus.

From the particulars given above, it will be seen that the difficulties in the present case could be overcome, (1) if the generic names *Cardinia* Roemer, 1839, and *Cardinia* Agassiz [1840], were to be suppressed by the Commission under its plenary powers (thereby making the name *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841].

objectively available), (2) if all generic names of older date that have as their type species species which are today subjectively regarded as being referable to the genus *Cardinia* (as universally understood) were to be suppressed under the same powers, and (3) if *Unio listeri* Sowerby were to be designated as the type species of *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841].

In addition to the generic name *Thalassides* Berger, 1833 (to which reference has already been made), there is another generic name which is subjectively identical with *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841], and may have priority over that name. This is the name *Sinemuria* de Christol, 1841 (*Bull. Soc. géol. France* (1) **12**: 92), which was applied by its original author to a species which is now considered to belong to the genus *Cardinia*. The difficulty which arises in this case is that, whereas it is known that the name *Sinemuria* de Christol was published in 1841 just before 26th May (the date of the recorded receipt by the Geological Society of London of the part of the *Bull. Soc. géol. France* in which this name appeared), no evidence has yet been found as to the exact date of publication of page 207 of Agassiz's German edition of the *Mineral Conchology*, although it is believed to have been in the same year. Thus, *Sinemuria* may have been published before the foregoing publication of the name *Cardinia*. In any case, the latter can at present rank for priority only as from 31st December, 1841 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 223-225). Accordingly, as matters now stand, the name *Sinemuria* de Christol, May, 1841, has priority over *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841] (ranking as from 31st December of that year). It is essential therefore that, as part of the general settlement of the problem raised by the name *Cardinia*, the name *Sinemuria* de Christol should be suppressed, since otherwise it would take precedence over the name *Cardinia*.

In addition, there are several names which, on the validation of the name *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841], it would be desirable should be finally disposed of, by being placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*. Three of these names are objective synonyms of *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841]; one is a *nomen nudum*; two are invalid junior homonyms of older names. The six names in question are: (1) *Ginorga* Gray, 1840 (*Syn. Contents Brit. Mus.* (ed. 42): 150) (a *nomen nudum*); (2) *Ginorga* (Gray, *nom. nud.*) Strickland, 1842 (*Rep. Brit. Ass. (Plymouth, 1841) Trans. Sect.*: 65) (cited as a synonym of *Cardinia*); (3) *Dihora* ("Gray") [Anon.], 1842 (*Neues Jahrb. Min.* **1842**: 496) (cited as a synonym of *Cardinia*); (4) *Pachyodon* Stutchbury, 1842 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* **8**: 481) (a homonym of *Pachyodon* Meyer, 1838, *Jahrb. f. Min.* **1838**: 414); (5) *Thalassites* Quenstedt, 1843 (*Floezgeb. Wuertemb.* **1843**: 143) (an emendation of *Thalassides* Berger, 1833) (a homonym of *Thalassites* Swainson, 1837, *Nat. Hist. Classif. Birds* **2**: 372); (6) *Storhodon* ("Brown") Zittel, 1881 (*Palaeozool.* **2**: 62) (name attributed to Brown without a bibliographical reference and cited as a synonym of *Cardinia*).

After careful consideration, I have come to the conclusion that, in order to prevent the most serious confusion, accompanied by a far-reaching disturbance in the nomenclature of this group, it is essential that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its plenary powers to such extent as is necessary to validate the generic name *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841]

(as published on page 207 of the German edition of Sowerby's *Mineral Conchology*) with *Unio listeri* Sowerby, 1817, as type species. The proposal which I accordingly submit is that the International Commission should :—

(1) use its plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress the under-mentioned names for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy :—

(i) *Cardinia* Roemer, 1839 ;

(ii) *Cardinia* Agassiz [1840] ;

(b) to suppress the under-mentioned generic names for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—

(i) *Thalassides* Berger, 1833 ;

(ii) *Sinemuria* de Christol, 1841 ;

(c) to validate the generic name *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841] (as published on page 207 of the German edition of Sowerby's *Mineral Conchology*), with *Unio listeri* Sowerby, 1817, as type species ;

(d) to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the trivial name *coburgensis* Berger, 1833 (as published in the binominal combination *Thalassides coburgensis*) ;

(2) place the generic name *Cardinia* Agassiz [1841], as proposed under (1) (c) above to be validated under the plenary powers (type species, by designation under the plenary powers under (1) (c) above : *Unio listeri* Sowerby, 1817) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the under-mentioned rejected or invalid names :—

(a) the two names specified in (1) (a) above, proposed to be suppressed for all purposes under the plenary powers ;

(b) the two names specified in (1) (b) proposed to be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, under the plenary powers ;

(c) the name *Cardinia* Agassiz, 1838 (an invalid name, because not published with an indication) ;

(d) the name *Ginorga* Gray, 1840 (a *nomen nudum*) ;

(e) the under-mentioned objective synonyms of *Cardinia* Agassiz, 1841 (as proposed under (1) (c) to be validated under the plenary powers) :—

(i) *Ginorga* Strickland, 1842 ;

- (ii) *Dihora* [Anon.], 1842 ;
- (iii) *Storhodon* Zittel, 1881 ;
- (f) the under-mentioned invalid homonyms :—
 - (i) *Pachyodon* Stutchbury, 1842 ;
 - (ii) *Thalassites* Quenstedt, 1843 ;
- (4) place the specific trivial name *listeri* Sowerby, 1817 (as published in the binominal combination *Unio listeri*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;
- (5) place the specific trivial name *coburgensis* Berger, 1833 (as published in the binominal combination *Thalassides coburgensis*) (as proposed under (1) (d) above to be suppressed under the plenary powers for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

CONTENTS :

(continued from front wrapper)

Proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name <i>Scaphander</i> Montfort, 1810 (Class Gastropoda, Order Tectibranchiata). By Henning Lemche (<i>Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen</i>)	Page 35
Proposed suppression under the plenary powers of the generic name <i>Monoculus</i> Linnaeus, 1758. By H. Munro Fox, F.R.S. (<i>Bedford College, London University</i>)	37
Proposal that the generic name <i>Rantus</i> Dejean, 1833 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera), should be amended to <i>Rhantus</i> under Article 19 and that the type species of this genus should be determined under the procedure laid down for dealing with genera based upon misidentified type species. By F. Balfour-Browne, M.A. (<i>Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London</i>)	40
Proposed validation under the plenary powers of the names <i>Acantholyda</i> Costa, 1894 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), and <i>Acanthocnema</i> Becker, 1894 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By R. B. Benson, M.A. (<i>Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London</i>)	46
Proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic names <i>Rhina</i> Latreille [1802-1803], and <i>Magdalis</i> Germar, 1817, for use respectively in their accustomed sense (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By J. Chester Bradley (<i>Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.</i>)	47
Proposed addition to the <i>Official List of Generic Names in Zoology</i> of the names of thirteen genera in the Order Collembola (Class Insecta). By Hermann Gisin (<i>Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Genève</i>)	56
Proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the generic name <i>Cardinia</i> (Class Lamellibranchiata) as from Agassiz [1841], for use in its accustomed sense. By L. R. Cox, Sc.D., F.R.S. (<i>Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History), London</i>)	59

Notice to Subscribers

The concluding Part (Part 12) of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (containing the Title Page, indexes, etc., for that volume) is now in the press and will be published shortly.

Form of Applications to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Zoologists proposing to submit applications to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are requested to submit those applications, in duplicate and typed, double-spaced, on one side of the page only, and with wide margins. Owing to the lack of staff available for copying applications not submitted in the foregoing form, preference for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* will necessarily be given to applications submitted in the form requested.

Full particulars of the bibliographical and other data required to be included in applications submitted to the International Commission will be found in the "Instructions to Authors" given on page 88 of Volume 1 of the present journal.

Publications of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The publications issued by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are on sale at the Offices of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7. All communications on this subject should be addressed to the Publications Officer.